

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 10-3836 PA (JCGx)	Date	December 14, 2010
Title	Richard Ressler, et al. v. Vietnam Maritime Communication and Electronics Co.		

Present: The Honorable	PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
Paul Songco	Not Reported		N/A
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter		Tape No.
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:		Attorneys Present for Defendants:	
None		None	

**Proceedings:** IN CHAMBERS – COURT ORDER

After having considered the arguments of the parties at the hearings held on November 22, 2010 and December 13, 2010, the Court orders the parties to show cause in writing why this matter should not be stayed pending completion of the arbitration proceedings between defendant Vietnam Maritime Communication and Electronics Company, Universal Telecom Services, Inc., and Binh Minh Trading Co. Ltd.

The Ninth Circuit has determined that “[a] trial court may, with propriety, find it is efficient for its own docket and the fairest course for the parties to enter a stay of an action before it, pending resolution of independent proceedings which bear upon the case,” whether those proceedings are “judicial, administrative, or arbitral in character.” Leyva v. Certified Grocers of California Ltd., 593 F.2d 857, 863-64 (9th Cir. 1979) (internal citations omitted). “The power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” Landis v. North Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254-255, 57 S.Ct. 163, 166, 81 L.Ed. 153 (1936); see Rohan ex rel. Gates v. Woodford, 334 F.3d 803, 817 (9th Cir. 2003).

Accordingly, the Court orders the parties to show cause in writing why this action should not be stayed pending the conclusion of the arbitration proceedings before the Singapore International Arbitration Centre. The parties’ responses shall be filed by December 20, 2010.

IT IS SO ORDERED.